United Nations A/58/301

General Assembly

Distr.: General
11 September 2003
English
Original: Arabic/English/French/
Spanish

Fifty-eighth session
Item 93 (a) of the provisional agenda*
Macroeconomic policy questions: international trade and development

Unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries

Report of the Secretary-General**

Summary

The present report is submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 56/179, entitled "Unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries". In accordance with that resolution, the Secretary-General invited the Governments of all States to provide their views or any other relevant information on the issue of unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries. The texts of the replies received from Argentina, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Czech Republic, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia and Venezuela are reproduced in the report.

* A/58/150.

** The document was submitted late to the conference services without the explanation required under paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 53/208 B, by which the Assembly decided that, if a report is submitted late, the reason should be included in a footnote to the document.

03-48631 (E) 021003

Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	3
II.	Replies received from States	3
	Argentina	3
	Costa Rica	4
	Cuba	4
	Czech Republic	6
	Islamic Republic of Iran	6
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	8
	Syrian Arab Republic	12
	Thailand	13
	Tunisia	13
	Venezuela	14

I. Introduction

1. The present report is submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 56/179 of 21 December 2001, entitled "Unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries". In that resolution, the Assembly, inter alia, urged the international community to adopt urgent and effective measures to eliminate the use of unilateral coercive economic measures against developing countries that were not authorized by relevant organs of the United Nations or were inconsistent with the principles of international law as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and that contravened the basic principles of the multilateral trading system.

2. In the same resolution, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to continue to monitor the imposition of measures of that nature and to study the impact of such measures on the affected countries, including the impact on trade and development, and to report to the Assembly at its fifty-eighth session on the implementation of the resolution.

3. Accordingly, the Secretary-General, in a note verbale dated 16 June 2003, invited the Governments of all States to provide their views or any other relevant information on the issue. As at 8 August 2003, replies had been received from the following 10 States: Argentina, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Czech Republic, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia and Venezuela. The texts of the replies are reproduced in section II below.

II. Replies received from States

Argentina

[Original: Spanish]
[25 July 2003]

1. The Government of the Argentine Republic has fully implemented the provisions of resolution 56/179 and previous General Assembly resolutions on unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries.

2. On 5 September 1997, the Government of the Argentine Republic promulgated Act No. 24,871, which establishes the regulatory framework relating to the scope of foreign legislation within the national territory. Under that Act, foreign legislation that is aimed, directly or indirectly, at restricting or impeding the free flow of trade and the movement of capital, goods or persons to the detriment of a given country or group of countries shall neither be applicable nor have legal effects of any kind within the national territory.

3. Article 1 of the aforesaid Act stipulates that foreign legislation that seeks to have extraterritorial legal effects through the imposition of an economic embargo or limits on investment in a given country in order to elicit a change in the form of government of a country or affect its right to self-determination shall also be utterly inapplicable and devoid of legal effect.

4. The vote by Argentina for the adoption of General Assembly resolution 56/179 reflected the position of the Argentine Republic, which has traditionally been in favour of eliminating unilateral measures of this kind, as well as its firm commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, international law, the political independence of States and multilateralism.

5. Argentina, which joins in the nearly unanimous rejection by the international community of such unilateral measures, reiterates that their application does not contribute to the promotion of a democratic system or to the observance and protection of human rights.

Costa Rica

[Original: Spanish]
[18 July 2003]

1. Costa Rica reaffirms its disapproval of unilateral coercive economic measures that are not authorized by relevant organs of the United Nations or are inconsistent with the principles of international law as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and that contravene the basic principles of the multilateral trading system.

2. Costa Rica also supports the adoption by the international community of urgent and effective measures to eliminate the use of such measures, together with the monitoring and study by the Secretary-General of the impact of such measures on the affected countries.

3. The Government of Costa Rica believes (a) that such measures conflict with the principles of reciprocity and mutual advantage and with the elimination of market distortions; (b) that such measures have a negative impact on the economic and social development of the countries involved and that, in the final analysis, they unleash a recession in the international trading system; and (c) that the Secretariat should take stricter steps to prevent developed countries from imposing such measures.

Cuba

[Original: Spanish]
[4 August 2003]

1. The Government of the Republic of Cuba strongly and unequivocally rejects any application of unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries.

2. The use of unilateral coercive economic measures has a particularly unfavourable impact on the economies of developing countries and a general negative effect on international economic cooperation for development. In fact, their application is contrary to the spirit of such cooperation.

3. The General Assembly has repeatedly expressed its rejection of the application or the encouragement of the use by any State of unilateral economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights. That position was endorsed in its resolutions 44/215 of 22 December 1989, 46/210 of 20 December 1991, 48/168

of 21 December 1993, 50/96 of 20 December 1995, 52/181 of 18 December 1997, 54/200 of 22 December 1999 and 56/179 of 21 December 2001.

4. The General Assembly has also stated that the enactment of such laws constitutes interference in the internal affairs of States and a violation of their sovereignty and that it is incompatible with international instruments such as the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 2131 (XX) of 21 December 1965, and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, proclaimed in its resolution 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974. Both instruments stipulate that no State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights.

5. Such measures also flagrantly contravene the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, annexed to General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV) of 24 October 1970, which provides that "No State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights and to secure from it advantages of any kind."

6. The use of unilateral economic measures also infringes the terms of the Millennium Declaration, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 55/2 of 8 September 2000, particularly paragraph 13 thereof, which calls for "an open, equitable, rule-based, predictable and non-discriminatory multilateral trading and financial system".

7. In most cases, the countries affected by the application of unilateral coercive economic measures are developing countries. This has a negative impact on the efforts of their national authorities to promote sustained economic growth and sustainable development in accordance with their national goals and priorities. Consequently, the application of such measures also affects the ability of such countries to achieve internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals.

8. Certain developed countries apply such measures against a large group of developing countries. This is true of the United States of America, which uses such sanctions openly and with great severity, applying a sanctions regime to 78 States, 60 of which are developing countries, according to the *2002 Sanctions Study*, published by USA Engage.

9. The Government of the Republic of Cuba considers that such measures are contrary to the principles and norms of international law, including the laws, principles and norms regulating world trade, and that they undermine the rules of free trade set out by the World Trade Organization.

10. One irrefutable example of the application of unilateral economic measures as a means of putting political and economic pressure on developing countries is the genocidal blockade policy imposed unilaterally against the Cuban people for over 40 years by the United States Government in its determination to force them to abandon their attachment to the full exercise of self-determination and their desire for independence, social justice and equity.

11. The escalation of the hostile blockade policy by the current United States Administration demonstrates irrefutably its lack of respect for the will of the overwhelming majority of the international community, as expressed in successive General Assembly resolutions. The intensified and sustained application of this illegal policy against Cuba is also conclusive evidence of the total contempt of the United States Government for international law and the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

12. The Government of the Republic of Cuba aspires to a world order characterized by full and equitable respect for international law as the essential paradigm of peaceful coexistence and justice on earth. It therefore joins in the broad international condemnation that such legislation has provoked and once more expresses its hope that the necessary political will exists to enforce the decisions of the international community.

Czech Republic

[Original: English]
[7 August 2003]

The Czech Republic, in line with the provision of paragraph 2 of resolution 56/179, applies no unilateral economic means against other countries.

Islamic Republic of Iran

[Original: English]
[10 July 2003]

1. It is indeed regrettable that the international community must address an issue that is undermining the very foundations of the principle of multilateralism, which is the cornerstone of the functioning of the United Nations system. The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran expresses its deep disappointment over the ongoing application of unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures by a single country that is, ironically, a pioneer and standard-bearer in the setting of international norms.

2. The General Assembly, in its several successive resolutions, has expressed its deep concern at the negative impact of unilaterally imposed extraterritorial coercive economic measures on trade and on financial and economic cooperation, including trade and cooperation at the regional level, as well as the serious obstacles they pose to the free flow of trade and capital at the regional and international levels.

3. The Member States, in adopting these resolutions, have rejected the application of extraterritorial coercive economic measures or legislative enactments unilaterally imposed by any State. They have also called for the repeal of unilateral extraterritorial laws that impose sanctions on corporations and nationals of other States.

4. The promulgation and application of laws or regulations that have extraterritorial effects or that affect the sovereignty of other States and the legitimate interests of entities or persons under their jurisdiction — a clear violation of the

universally accepted principles of international law — has been strongly rejected on various occasions by the overwhelming majority of States.

5. The Havana South Summit and the recent Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Kuala Lumpur, called for the elimination and rejection of coercive economic measures and the extraterritorial implementation of such laws against developing countries.

6. At the same time, an increasing number of voices, from multilateral forums, regional bodies and the private sector have joined the international community in calling for the total elimination and lifting of unilateral extraterritorial and other forms of coercive economic measures.

7. Coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion, in particular through the enactment of extraterritorial legislation, not only are against the well-recognized provisions and principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, but also threaten the basic fabric of international peace, security and stability and violate the sovereignty of States. They also impede and constrain the settlement of disputes through the promotion of mutual dialogue, understanding and peaceful means.

8. In an era of rapid and unprecedented change, the world needs peace, security and stability, which could be strengthened through, inter alia, collective responsibility of countries, respect for sovereignty, rejection of interference in the internal affairs of other States, refraining from compulsion and intimidation and the creation of an enabling environment for replacing conflict and relations of inequality with dialogue and negotiations.

9. These measures have a serious adverse impact on the overall economic, commercial, political, social and cultural life of the targeted countries, and intensify their challenges in the time of globalization and its concomitant traumatic transformations. Moreover, they have an adverse impact on the transfer of technology, increase the risks of investment, threaten financial and monetary management, weaken industrial and agricultural infrastructures and undermine the commercial policies of the targeted countries.

10. Such coercive measures reduce the actual and potential capacities of targeted countries in the very important areas of health and education, two basic elements of every social welfare programme. This delays the development of their economic infrastructure and results in further deterioration of regional social and economic outlooks.

11. The enforcement of unilateral coercive economic measures, in defiance of the Charter of the United Nations, has inflicted grave and irreparable losses, including heavy financial and human tolls, on the targeted countries. In this context, the Islamic Republic of Iran, as one of the affected countries, reserves its right to pursue its financial and intellectual claims and to lodge its complaint against Governments enacting those measures. Furthermore, the Islamic Republic of Iran requests the United Nations to call for the abrogation of those measures through concrete actions. All countries should, in the true spirit of multilateralism and sincere observance of international laws and regulations, avoid resorting to and enacting such measures.

12. While appreciating the report of the Secretary-General under the agenda item entitled "Elimination of unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion", the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran is of the view that the report should, in addition to presenting a compilation of the views of the Member States on this issue, contain concrete proposals and recommendations as to how the United Nations system could deal with this fundamental threat to the very roots of its foundation.

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

[Original: Arabic]
[4 August 2003]

1. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya reaffirms its condemnation and firm rejection of any measures that bar any State from exercising its full political rights in choosing its political, economic and social systems, because this constitutes a flagrant violation of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States, adopted by the General Assembly on 24 October 1970.

2. The General Assembly has on a number of occasions expressed its concern at the enactment by certain States of extraterritorial laws that violate the sovereignty of other States and adversely affect the interests of corporations and their personnel. All the instruments and resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in this regard affirm that the enactment of such laws undermines the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, is a gross violation of the rule of law, inflicts serious economic damage on developing and developed countries alike and impedes the endeavours of the international community aimed at constructive cooperation and mutually beneficial exchange.

3. The General Assembly has also affirmed that the enactment of such laws is an interference in the internal affairs of States and a violation of their sovereignty and is incompatible with international instruments, including the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty, adopted by the Assembly in its resolution 2131 (XX) of 21 December 1965, and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, proclaimed by the General Assembly in its resolution 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974. Both these instruments specify that no State is entitled to use or encourage the use of economic or political measures or any other form of pressure to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its political rights.

4. By adopting such resolutions and instruments, the General Assembly has given clear expression to the overwhelming rejection by Member States of coercive measures and the strength of their opposition to the use of such measures against other States as a means of compulsion and of forcing them to accept policies that are not appropriate for or satisfactory to them. An international consensus has developed with regard to the need for a halt to be put to such measures, which are adopted by certain States in the furtherance of their foreign policies and employed in their dealings with other States.

5. The States concerned should comply with and respect the will of the international community, as expressed in the resolutions, declarations and instruments adopted at various levels within the United Nations and other bodies. However, the measures they have taken and the practices they pursue demonstrate that their intentions are quite different. The United States of America, which, while not alone, is the State that has the greatest recourse to this type of measure, has ignored international demands and has continued its policy of imposing sanctions and embargoes: in mid-1996, its Senate adopted the D'Amato-Kennedy Act, which penalizes foreign companies and individuals that invest in the Libyan oil sector.

6. As was to be expected, the promulgation of that Act was widely greeted with unease, rejection and disapproval, and, in its resolution 55/6 of 26 October 2000, the General Assembly expressed its deep concern at the negative impact of unilaterally imposed extraterritorial coercive economic measures in the field of trade practices and financial and economic cooperation and called for the immediate repeal of those unilateral laws. It also called upon all States not to recognize unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures or legislative acts imposed by any State.

7. By its resolution 56/179 of 21 December 2001, the General Assembly also expressed its concern at the use of unilateral coercive economic measures that adversely affect the economy and development efforts of developing countries in particular, and that have a general negative impact on international economic cooperation and on worldwide efforts to move towards a non-discriminatory and open multilateral trading system.

8. In addition, other international organizations, including the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the League of Arab States and the Group of 77 and China, have openly rejected coercive measures, while the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity has demanded the elimination of such measures. Meetings of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Head of State or Government and ministerial levels, have condemned such laws and the insistence of some States on applying and reinforcing them unilaterally, have affirmed that such measures as the D'Amato-Kennedy Act represent a violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, and have called upon the international community to take effective measures to halt this tendency.

9. The United States of America should have responded to the resolutions and calls of States, regional organizations and the General Assembly, which, in its resolutions 55/6, 56/179 and 57/5, expressed its deep concern at the negative impact of coercive measures and the serious obstacles they posed to freedom of trade at the regional and international levels. The Assembly also reiterated its call for the repeal of unilateral extraterritorial laws that impose sanctions on corporations and nationals of other States. However, the United States did quite the opposite: not only did it ignore the calls made by States and international and regional organizations for the repeal of the coercive economic measures provided for in the D'Amato-Kennedy Act, but it proceeded to apply those measures. On 3 January 2000, the President of the United States addressed letters to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, notifying them of the extension beyond 7 January 2000 of the sanctions imposed on the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, pursuant to the national emergency declared on 7 January 1986. The most conspicuous factor that clearly demonstrates the United States Administration's disdain for the will of the international community was the decision issued by it to the Committee on Foreign

Relations of the United States House of Representatives on 22 June 2002, extending the D'Amato-Kennedy Act for five more years.

10. The United States of America claimed that the promulgation of Act H.R. 3107, known as the D'Amato-Kennedy Act, was in response to the failure of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to comply with Security Council resolutions 731 (1992), 748 (1992) and 883 (1993), and was aimed at halting its attempts to acquire weapons of mass destruction and maintaining economic pressure on Libya in order to restrict its ability to finance international terrorism.

11. In fact, there is not a grain of truth in the pretexts used by the United States Administration to extend the imposition of its coercive measures against Libya. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has carried out in full the demands of the Security Council in its resolutions, as was affirmed by the Secretary-General in his report (S/1999/726) submitted to the Security Council pursuant to paragraph 16 of its resolution 883 (1993) and paragraph 8 of its resolution 1192 (1998). Both directly and through regional and international organizations, such as the Organization of African Unity, the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the League of Arab States and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, States have recognized this compliance.

12. The claim that the D'Amato-Kennedy Act was intended to deprive the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya of a resource that it used to finance international terrorism is completely groundless, unsubstantiated by the evidence and facts. Not only has Libya frequently and repeatedly condemned international terrorism in all its forms and whatever its origin, but it is also a party to most of the international conventions on the elimination of international terrorism.

13. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is so concerned to ensure that this phenomenon is suppressed that, in 1992, it called for the holding of a special session of the General Assembly to prepare an effective programme to combat terrorism, including international terrorism, of which the Libyan people have been victims.

14. The United States of America appears to imagine that Libya is attempting to manufacture weapons of mass destruction and, eager to restrict the proliferation of such weapons, wishes to stop those endeavours by means of the D'Amato-Kennedy Act. The United States should remember that Libya is a party to most of the disarmament conventions, foremost among them being the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We must therefore ask ourselves which country it is that stockpiles nuclear weapons: is it not the United States of America that has the largest arsenal of such weapons and is seeking to increase their effectiveness?

15. One of the misapprehensions informing the reasoning behind the D'Amato-Kennedy Act is that the conduct of Libya represents a threat to the national security of the United States. The international community certainly recognizes the spurious nature of this claim: it is inconceivable that Libya, with its small population and limited resources, could constitute a threat of any kind whatsoever to the security of the United States, which is thousands of miles away. On the contrary, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, which gained independence through the 1996 revolution, cleared its soil of foreign military bases and achieved self-determination and control over its own resources, and has, ever since, been subject to United States threats and coercive practices on a number of fronts, including the following:

(a) In 1981, the United States Government closed the Libyan People's Bureau in Washington and imposed restrictions on the movement of members of the Permanent Mission of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations in New York. At the same time, the United States Government cancelled the residency permits of Libyan students studying in the United States and imposed a complete embargo on American exports to Libya, including irrigation equipment. It also halted all projects being undertaken in Libya in which American companies were in any way involved;

(b) In 1982, the United States Administration banned the sale to Libya of American civilian aircraft and of any other aircraft in the construction of which American technology was used. With effect from 1986, it banned the export to the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya of any American commodities or technology, including the spare parts essential to ensuring the safety of civilian aircraft and aviation, and imposed an embargo on air traffic between the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the United States of America and on the sale of tickets for air travel that included the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in its itinerary. In that same year, the President of the United States signed an executive order to freeze all Libyan assets and property in the United States, including the assets of official organizations and institutions and assets held or managed by Americans or in American offshore banks. More than $1 billion was frozen as a result;

(c) The United States Government carried out media campaigns aimed at obfuscating the position of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and blackening its international reputation. United States fleets in the Mediterranean Sea carried out acts of provocation and manoeuvres off the Libyan coast, which culminated in 1986 when the United States unleashed a military and naval onslaught inside Libyan territorial waters and on the main cities, in particular Tripoli and Benghazi, which caused scores of fatalities and an even greater number of injuries, in addition to the destruction of property.

16. In view of the above, the only explanation for the promulgation of the D'Amato-Kennedy Act is that it is just another chapter in the series of United States operations against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. The most alarming aspect of it is that it intensifies the action that has been taken against the Libyan people by the United States of America for almost two decades. It provides for the imposition of sanctions on corporations and nationals of other States that work with the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in the field of oil and reinforces the embargo that the United States has imposed on the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in this respect since 1981, when the President of the United States signed an executive order banning the export of equipment, machinery, materials, spare parts and any American technology for use in the production of Libyan oil. The intention was to destroy this sector completely, and it is easy to appreciate just how devastating the effect of these measures was on a country in which oil is the principal source of national revenue and provides the main funding for economic and social development plans.

17. These examples demonstrate the effects accruing from the implementation of the provisions of the D'Amato-Kennedy Act, which is the subject of General Assembly resolutions 51/22, 53/10, 55/6 and 57/5. They also demonstrate the other effects of United States practices against the Libyan people, including denying them access to knowledge, technology and the benefits of scientific development, confiscating their assets, preventing them from implementing vital projects and

putting obstacles in the path of economic cooperation with other countries by frightening off and terrorizing their corporations and nationals in order to prevent them from investing in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. While drawing attention yet again to the dangers of these measures, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya repeats its appeal to the international community, through the General Assembly and the other international organizations, to resolutely oppose United States aiins in promulgating the D'Amato-Kennedy Act, or any other extraterritorial coercive economic measures that have been adopted in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and other rules of international law.

18. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya also urges the States of the world to make it clear to the State that promulgated this Act, and that insists that it continue to be implemented, that this is a glaring error that must not continue. That State's sovereignty is not superior to that of any other State, and the international community has not delegated to it the administration of global affairs through its domestic legislation.

19. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya again urges the international community strongly to reject the imposition of laws and prescriptions that have extraterritorial implications and other forms of coercive economic measures, including unilateral sanctions against developing countries, and reiterates the urgent need for them to be repealed forthwith. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya stresses that measures of this type are not merely destructive of the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and international law, but also pose a grave threat to freedom of trade and investment. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya urges the international community not to recognize or implement such measures.

Syrian Arab Republic

[Original: Arabic]
[3 July 2003]

1. The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic underlines respect for the right of all peoples to self-determination, to determine their political status and to pursue economic and social development, and stresses its rejection of unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion. It therefore voted in favour of resolution 56/179.

2. In its relevant resolutions, the most recent of which was resolution 57/5, the General Assembly has expressed its grave concern over the negative impact of unilateral extraterritorial coercive measures and called upon all States not to recognize or apply unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures imposed by any State that are contrary to recognized principles of international law. The General Assembly has reiterated its call for the repeal of unilateral extraterritorial laws and reaffirmed that all peoples have the right to self-determination, and that by virtue of that right they are entitled to freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.

3. Against that background, the Syrian Arab Republic refers to the Declaration of the South Summit of the Group of 77 and China, held in Havana, in which the Heads of State and Government of the members of that Group declared their firm rejection of the imposition of laws and regulations with extraterritorial impact and all other

forms of coercive economic measures, and emphasized that such actions not only undermined the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and international law, but also severely threatened freedom of trade and investment. They therefore called on the international community neither to recognize nor to apply those measures.

4. The Syrian Arab Republic also refers to the Declaration issued by the Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in Kuala Lumpur on 24 and 25 February 2003, in which they expressed their appreciation of the right of States to freely determine their political, economic and social status. The Movement condemned the continued application by certain States of extraterritorial legislation and measures and further condemned the imposition by those States of unilateral coercive economic measures against specific developing countries. It also reiterated its call on all States not to recognize unilateral extraterritorial laws promulgated by certain States that impose penalties on the companies and individuals of other countries, given that such laws and measures represent a challenge to the sovereignty of States, have an adverse impact on economic and social development and marginalize developing countries in their progress towards globalization. Furthermore, they contravene international law, the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the principles and norms that govern healthy relations between States and the agreed principles that govern the multilateral trading system.

5. The Syrian Arab Republic therefore calls for an end to unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion. That would make way for a positive climate in international relations and strengthen the role of the United Nations in safeguarding the principle of sovereignty and equality between States.

Thailand

[Original: English]
[2 July 2003]

Thailand supports the role of the United Nations in the monitoring of the imposition of unilateral coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries. Thailand believes that any economic and political exercise should be achieved through voluntary and constructive cooperation and in conformity with the principles of international law. Such an exercise should in no way be used to coerce other countries in order to obtain benefits from it. In Thailand's view, the use of coercive economic measures is inconsistent with the principle of good cooperation among States.

Tunisia

[Original: French]
[23 June 2003]

The Government of Tunisia does not apply unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries.

Venezuela

[Original: Spanish]
[11 July 2003]

1. First, as a general comment, based on the reply transmitted by the Venezuelan Government to the Secretary-General pursuant to the request contained in General Assembly resolution 57/11, concerning the item entitled "Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba", Venezuela considers it relevant and appropriate to point out that it has consistently and repeatedly rejected the promulgation and implementation of laws and regulations with extraterritorial effects that infringe the sovereignty of other States and the legitimate interests of entities or persons under their jurisdiction and that have a negative impact on the freedom of international trade and development.

2. Venezuela considers that unilateral measures of a coercive and extraterritorial nature have an adverse impact on the legal framework defining economic and commercial exchanges between nations and undermine the efforts that have been made to achieve continental and subregional economic integration.

3. Venezuela's position on this matter has been expressed consistently in various international forums in which the subject of the application of unilateral coercive measures with extraterritorial effects has been discussed, such as during consideration of the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba, and has also been duly reflected in the declarations adopted, the most recent of which are referred to below.

4. The Heads of State and Government of the European Union and of Latin America and the Caribbean, meeting in Madrid, adopted on 17 May 2002 a political declaration, the Madrid Commitment, whereby they firmly rejected all measures of a unilateral character and with extraterritorial effect that are contrary to international law and the commonly accepted rules of free trade, and agreed that this type of practice poses a serious threat to multilateralism.

5. In the Bávaro Declaration, adopted at the Twelfth Ibero-American Summit, held in the Dominican Republic on 15 and 16 November 2002, the Heads of State and Government condemned measures such as the embargo against Cuba in the following terms: "We reaffirm our strong rejection of the unilateral application of extraterritorial laws or measures which are contrary to international law, open markets and global trade freedom."

6. In the Final Document of the Twelfth Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held from 25 to 27 February 2003 in Kuala Lumpur, the Heads of State or Government again called upon the Government of the United States to put an end to the economic, financial and commercial embargo against Cuba, which, in addition to being unilateral and contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and to the principles of international law, is causing tremendous material losses and economic damage to the people of Cuba.

7. The position of Venezuela is consistent with the almost unanimous rejection by the international community of the promulgation and application of unilateral and extraterritorial coercive measures of this kind, which are a clear violation of the

fundamental principles of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations. In Venezuela's view, no State may apply or promote the use of unilateral measures of an economic, political or other character in order to coerce another State into subordinating the exercise of its sovereign rights.